



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,462	11/19/2003	Kang Soo Seo	46500-000581/US	3758
30593	7590	05/12/2009	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195			SHIBRUI, HELEN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			2621	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/12/2009			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/715,462	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SEO ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> HELEN SHIBRU	<b>Art Unit</b> 2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,7,15-17,19-22,27,28 and 30-37 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,15-17,19-22,27,28 and 30-37 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date  
 04/13/09 03/26/09 03/23/09 03/10/09 03/04/09 12/30/08 12/19/08 11/13/08

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_



**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendments, filed 02/06/2009, have been entered and made of record. Claims 1, 15-17, 19-22, 27-28, and 30-37 are now pending.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 15-17, 19-22, 27-28, and 30-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 15-17, 19-22, 27-28, and 30-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (US PG PUB 2002/0145702 A1) in view of Hamasaka (US PG PUB 2008/0019672) and further in view of Hamada (US PG PUB 2008/0253742).

Regarding claim 1, Kato discloses a computer readable medium storing a data structure for managing reproduction of at least video and audio data performed by a reproduction device comprising: a data area storing a stream file including at least one of video and audio data (see figure 14 M2TS); and a clip information area storing a clip information file (see figure 14 CLIPINF), including timing information of the at least one of video and audio data (see paragraphs 0167, 0199 and 0267); a playlist area storing a playlist file including at least one playitem (see figure 14, PLAYLIST), identifying a playing interval in a clip of the at least one of

video data and audio data (see paragraphs 0168, and 0268-0274); a navigation area storing at least one navigation file (see fig. 28 and paragraphs 0226, 0234, and figures 6, 9, and 14); and the stream file, the clip information file, and the playlist file, are separate from each other (see figure 14 where it shows the PLAYLIST, the CLIPINF, and M2TS are recorded separately).

Claim 1 differs from Kato in that the claim further requires the navigation file including a path item, the path item including a first navigation command for launching the playlist file and a second navigation command for proceeding to a next path item where the path item providing parental control information for the at least one of video and audio data.

In the same field of endeavor Hamasaka teaches a navigation file (see VIDEO.RT.IFO.FILE in figure 7) including a path item (see entry point table 80 in figure 8), the path item including a first navigation command for launching the playlist file (see paragraph 206 and figure 14 where the prior art teaches displaying the path item (entry point table 80) on the display device gives the user the capability of launching a desired playlist file (program), i.e. the user has the capability to select a desired playback start position) and a second navigation command for proceeding to a next path item (see paragraph 0149-0150 the user has the capability to select or click on one of the play item (from the entry point table as shown in figure 14), for example selecting a parental control option from the displayed entry point table in order to restrict viewing content available to children) where the path item providing parental control information for the at least one of video and audio data (see figure 14 where it shows parental control information is recorded on entry point table where the entry point table is recorded on VIDEO.RT.IFO.FILE). Therefore in light of the teaching in Hamasaka it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kato by

providing a path item to launch playlist file and next path item in order to access and read a particular location in the stream.

Claim 1 further differs from Kato and Hamasaka in that the claim further requires the stream files, the clip information file, the playlist file an the navigation file are separate and have different extensions from each other.

In the same field of endeavor Hamada teaches the stream files (AV stream with extension mpg), the clip information file CLIPINF with extension clpi), the playlist file (PLAYLIST with extension plist) and the navigation file (info with extension dvr) are separate and have different extensions from each other (see figure 5). Therefore in light of the teaching in Hamada it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above proposed combination by separating the files in order to control or have access to each file individually.

Regarding claim 15, Hamasaka discloses the path item further includes a length indicator indicating a length of the path item (see paragraphs 0106, 0166 and figure 10A, see also figure 6 in Hamada).

Regarding claim 16, Hamasaka discloses the path item further includes an attribute indicator providing an indication of at least one attribute of the path item (see paragraphs 0076, 0148 and figure 14 and claim 1 rejection above).

Regarding claim 17, Hamasaka discloses the navigation file further includes a field indicating a number of the path items in the navigation file (see claim 1 rejection above and paragraphs 0149, 0155 and 0183).

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above. See also claim 4 of Hamasak and claim 6 of Hamada.

Regarding claim 21, the limitation of claim 21 can be found in claim 1 above. Therefore claim 21 is analyzed and rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 1 above. See also claim 4 of Hamasak and claim 6 of Hamada.

Regarding claim 22, the limitation of claim 22 can be found in claims 1, 20 and 21 above. Therefore claim 22 is analyzed and rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claims 1, 20 and 21.

Regarding claim 27, Hamasaka discloses an interface unit configures to communicate with the controller to select one of the different parental control reproduction paths (see figure 14 and paragraphs 0144 and 0149, see also claim 1 rejection above).

Regarding claim 28, Hamasaka discloses wherein the interface unit receives user input on the different parental control reproduction paths, and the controller controls the reproduction of the at least one of video and audio data based on the user input (see paragraphs 0145, 0150 and 0179).

Claim 30 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 16 above.

Claims 31, 33, 35, and 37 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 17 above.

Claims 32, 34, and 36 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 16 above.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HELEN SHIBRU whose telephone number is (571)272-7329. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, THAI Q. TRAN can be reached on (571) 272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HELEN SHIBRU/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2621  
April 23, 2009

/Thai Tran/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621